

## **REMARKS**

### **Formal Matters**

Claims 1-51 are the claims currently pending in the Application.

Applicant appreciates that the Examiner finds claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 13, 15, 17, 25, 30, 31, 33, 38, 39, 41 and 43 to be allowable.

### **Specification**

In the specification, the paragraph beginning on page 10, line 2, has been amended to make minor editorial corrections.

### **Drawings**

A replacement Figure 9 is submitted herewith; it has been amended to make minor editorial corrections.

### **Rejection of Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 21, 29, 37, 40, 47 and 51 Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 21, 29, 37, 40, 47 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Timothy Bickmore et al., "Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users", The Computer Journal, Volume 42, No. 6, 1999 ("Bickmore") in view of Higuchi, U.S. Patent No. 6,313,735. This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

Bickmore discloses the Digester system, in which users of the wireless device specify a sizable font in order to allow the system to estimate a screen area of a text block to configure the Digester system (Bickmore, Paragraph 3.1). Bickmore discloses re-authoring Web documents for the display needs of wireless devices through a series of transformations performed on the Web document (Bickmore, Paragraphs 2.4 and

2.6). Bickmore further discloses a series of rules to be kept in mind for designing the image reduction and re-authoring techniques.

The Examiner acknowledges that Bickmore does not disclose determining the font by reference to a language selected in the wireless client. (Office Action, page 3). However, the Examiner alleges that Higuchi discloses these features.

Higuchi discloses a radio selective calling receiver that can display a message in a language corresponding to a current location without making a user recognize the current location, and that character fonts are automatically switched on the basis of the area information contained in a reception signal. (abstract, column 1, lines 49-52). Higuchi further discloses a control section, which determines a font table for a language used for display from the area-language correspondence section which is described as correspondence between pieces of area information, languages, and font tables. (column 3, line 66 to column 4 line 2, and column 4, lines 37-41). Higuchi does not disclose or suggest determining a font by reference to a language selected in a wireless client. The present invention provides more flexibility than prior art because the font to be used can be selected not merely predetermined based on area or other criteria.

Higuchi does not disclose or suggest determining the font by reference to a language selected in the wireless client, and the Examiner does not allege that it does so, as *inter alia*, required by independent claims 1, 12, 29, 37, 47 and 51. Therefore, the hypothetical combination of Bickmaore and Higuchi does not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims 1, 12, 29, 37, 47 and 51.

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1, claim 16 depends from independent claim 12, and claim 40 depends from independent claim 37. Therefore, claims 5, 16 and 40 incorporate novel and nonobvious features of their respective independent base claims and are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Independent claim 21 recites a font storing unit which is determined by the gateway server based on the language provided by the language notifying unit. Neither Bickmore nor Higuchi disclose or suggest this feature, and the Examiner provides no evidence that either does. Thus, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

#### **Rejection of Claims 3, 14 and 22**

Claims 3, 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious from over Bickmore and Higuchi, cited above, and being well known in the art. This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

The Examiner states that it is well known in the art to have an authenticating unit which performs authentication for connecting the wireless client to the gateway server as claimed in these claims. However, even if it were well known in the art to perform authentication in this manner, this does not remedy the deficiencies of the hypothetical combination of Bickmore and Higuchi as they relate to Applicant's invention as admitted by the Examiner and as discussed above. Independent claims 1, 12 and 21, from which claims 3, 14 and 22 depend, include at least the feature of

determining the font by reference to a language selected in the wireless client.

Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious from Bickmore and Higuchi and the Official Notice taken by the Examiner. This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

The Official Notice does not remedy the deficiencies of the hypothetical combination of Bickmore and Higuchi, admitted by the Examiner and as discussed above, as they relate to Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37, 37 and 47. Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 depend from independent claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37, 37 and 47, respectively, and thus incorporate novel and nonobvious features thereof. Accordingly, claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective independent base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Therefore, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

**Rejection of claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42**

Claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 being unpatentable over Bickmore in view of Higuchi and further in view of Simon, U.S. Patent No. 6,065,008. This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

Simon does not remedy the deficiencies of Bickmore combined with

Higuchi as they relate to applicant's invention as recited in independent claims 1, 21, 29 and 37. Therefore, since claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 depend from these independent base claims, respectively, claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 incorporate novel and nonobvious features thereof and are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective independent base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Therefore, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Katherine R. Vieyra  
Registration No. 47,155

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

KRV/kc